

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action dated September 22, 2005 holding the subject matter of claims 9-13 to be non-obvious and patentably distinct from that of claims 1-8, Applicant(s) hereby elect the invention of Group II, (upon which claims 1-8 are readable) for further substantive examination.


Applicants also add new claims 14 – 21, which refer to claims of the elected Group and which therefore also should be examined.

This election is made without traverse. However, since a restriction requirement is never proper unless the restricted group of claims is patentably distinct (i.e., *inter alia*, non-obvious under 35 USC §103) from the elected group of claims, the Examiner is requested to insure that such patentable distinctness is present before proceeding to make the requirement final.

It is respectfully requested that the non-elected claims be retained for use with a possible divisional application.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 
H. Warren Burnam, Jr.
Reg. No. 29,366

HWB:lsh
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100